

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on March 30, 2007, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, independent claims 1, 24, and 29 have been amended. The claims have been amended to specify periodically synchronizing the voice information application with a subscriber application associated with a subscriber data source to upload changes in the subscriber data source so that the subscriber obtains updated subscriber information in response to connecting the call to the voice information application. Support for this amendment may be found on page 13, lines 8-18 and on page 15, lines 13-18 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-5, 7-20, 22-27, and 29-37 are pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson (US 2004/0114733) in view of Sravanapudi et al. (US 7,167,830, hereinafter “Sravanapudi”). Claims 3, 9-14, 16-20, 24-27, and 29-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson in view of Cloutier et al. (US 6,535,586, hereinafter “Cloutier”) and further in view of Sravanapudi. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lawson, Cloutier, and Sravanapudi, and further in view of Johnstone et al. (US 4,463,080, hereinafter “Johnstone”).

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lawson in view of Sravanapudi. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a method of storing and accessing information to and from a remote voice information system. The method includes receiving a call to a voice information application wherein the call is routed to an intelligent network component and

wherein routing the call includes routing the call to the voice information application at a telecommunications system services node; connecting the call to the voice information application; forwarding a voice information message from a subscriber placing the call; storing the voice information message for subsequent retrieval by the subscriber; indexing the stored voice information message for locating the stored voice information by the voice information application; receiving a request for a stored text information message; and prior to receiving the request for a stored text information message, storing one or more text information messages for access by the voice information application; and periodically synchronizing the voice information application with a subscriber application associated with a subscriber data source to upload changes in the subscriber data source so that the subscriber obtains updated subscriber information in response to connecting the call to the voice information application.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Lawson and Sravanapudi fails to teach, disclose, or suggest all of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose at least periodically synchronizing the voice information application with a subscriber application associated with a subscriber data source to upload changes in the subscriber data source so that the subscriber obtains updated subscriber information in response to connecting the call to the voice information application.

Lawson discusses, among other features, flexible call alerting which may include receiving subscriber information and a message by an intelligent peripheral, storing the received information and the message in a database, setting an alert time based on the received information, determining that the alert time has been reached, obtaining the information and the message from the database, and initiating the delivery of the message to recipients based on the alert time (see Par. 0075). Lawson, however, fails to disclose at least receiving a request for a

stored text information message and prior to receiving the request for a stored text information message, storing one or more text information messages for access by the voice information application, as well as periodically synchronizing the voice information application with a subscriber application associated with a subscriber data source to upload changes in the subscriber data source so that the subscriber obtains updated subscriber information in response to connecting the call to the voice information application. For example, the Office Action acknowledges that Lawson does not disclose receiving a request for a stored text information message (see Office Action, page 3).

 Sravanapudi, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Lawson, discusses a network for providing multimodal information services including an information user, a multimodal information service mechanism, and an information source. The information user may send a request via the network to the mechanism to request a service which may include accessing information in different modalities through the mechanism. Based on the request, the mechanism obtains requested information from the information source via a platform that may convert the information from the information source into an appropriate modality (e.g., e-mail, fax, page, text, speech, etc.) suitable to the information user (see Fig. 5 and Col. 3, lines 49-55). Sravanapudi however, fails to disclose periodically synchronizing the voice information application with a subscriber application associated with a subscriber data source to upload changes in the subscriber data source so that the subscriber obtains updated subscriber information in response to connecting the call to the voice information application, as recited in amended claim 1.

 Based on the foregoing, the combination of Lawson and Sravanapudi fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, amended

claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 9-14, 16-20, 24-27, and 29-37

Claims 3, 9-14, 16-20, 24-27, and 29-37 are rejected as being unpatentable over Lawson in view of Cloutier and further in view of Sravanapudi. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3, 9-14, and 16-20 depend from amended claim 1 and thus recite at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Lawson and Sravanapudi fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, claims 3, 9-14, and 16-20 are allowable over the aforementioned combination for at least the same reasons. Cloutier, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of Lawson and Sravanapudi, discusses, among other features, generating a unique code for a message and allowing direct access to the content of the specific message. The unique code may be transmitted in a message alert (see Col. 2, lines 13-16). Cloutier however, as conceded in the Office Action, fails to disclose at least receiving a request for a stored text information message and prior to receiving the request for a stored text information message, storing one or more text information messages for access by the voice information application. It is respectfully submitted that Cloutier further fails to disclose periodically synchronizing the voice information application with a subscriber application associated with a subscriber data source to upload changes in the subscriber data source so that the subscriber obtains updated subscriber information in response to connecting the call to the voice information application.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Lawson, Cloutier, and Sravanapudi fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claims 3, 9-14, and 16-20. Therefore, these claims are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the foregoing reasons. Independent amended claims 24 and 29 recite similar features as claims 3, 9-14, and 16-20 and are thus also allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 25-26 and 30-37 depend from amended claims 24 and 29 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claim 15

Claim 15 is rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Lawson, Cloutier, and Sravanapudi and further in view of Johnstone. The rejection of this claim is respectfully traversed.

Claim 15 depends from amended claim 1 and thus recites at least the same features. As discussed above, the combination of Lawson, Cloutier, and Sravanapudi fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. Therefore, claim 15 is also allowable over the aforementioned combination for at least the same reasons. Johnstone, relied upon in the Office Action for allegedly curing the deficiencies of the aforementioned combination, discusses a voice actuated machine control in which voice commands are converted into digital signals (see Col. 2, lines 5-33). Johnstone however, fails to disclose fails to disclose at least receiving a request for a stored text information message and prior to receiving the request for a stored text information message, storing one or more text information messages for access by the voice information application or synchronizing the voice information application with a subscriber application associated with a subscriber data source to upload

changes in the subscriber data source so that the subscriber obtains updated subscriber information in response to connecting the call to the voice information application.

Based on the foregoing, the combination of Lawson, Cloutier, Sravanapudi, and Johnstone fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in claim 15. Therefore, this claim is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn for at least the foregoing reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5100

Date: June 29, 2007

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

